

DE-ROLING GOD

On Community, Multitude, and the Displacement of
the Self from the Now

Oscar Gaitan

May 9, 2026

*The concept of sin does not need to be prohibited. It only needs
to become quaint.*

*"...that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark."
Revelation 13:17*

*The modern system has accomplished, through frictionless
architectural means, what no empire achieved through force: the
voluntary departure of the **self** from the crossing point, thumb-
stroke by thumb-stroke, without awareness of loss, without a
struggle, and without a single argument against the existence of
God.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Keywords

A Note on Method

I. Prologue: The Wrong Battle

II. What God Actually Does

The Structure of the Now

From Thinness to Dependency: The Analytic Bridge

Why the Role Cannot Be Argued Away

III. Community and Multitude

The Topology of Presence

The Multitude and Its False Center

IV. Three Modes of Attack — and Why Only One Works

Mode One: Physical Elimination

Mode Two: Ideological Displacement

Mode Three: The Evacuation of the Now

V. The Machinery of Evacuation

Das Man at Scale — and Its Limit

The Chain of Hollow Centers

Satan Changed Careers

VI. The Self That Cannot Be Reached

Why the Crossing Point Survives

The Knock

VII. The Three Modes and the Topology of the Now

Why the Topology Explains What History Cannot

The Asymmetry That the Topology Reveals

VIII. Conclusion: The Ground That Cannot Be Made Uninhabitable

References

Sacred Scripture

Philosophical and Literary Sources

Cinematic and Television References

Author's Prior Works

Abstract

This essay argues that the primary threat to religious community in the modern world is not the denial of God's existence but the systematic displacement of His ontological function. Drawing on the Gaitan Topology – a philosophical framework grounded in the lemniscate, the crossing point, and the sustaining ground of the Now – the essay identifies three historical modes of attack against the non-derivative Being: physical elimination, ideological displacement, and the evacuation of the Now. Only the third succeeds. It succeeds not by arguing against God but by ensuring that the self is never present long enough at the crossing point to feel what holds it open. The essay traces this operation across three registers: the individual self, the social field, and the ontological structure of the present moment. It draws on Lope de Vega's *Fuenteovejuna*, the television series *Britannia*, the film *Ben-Hur*, the film *The Scarlet and the Black*, Heidegger's *Das Man*, the figure of Legion, and the Faustian bargain as restructured by the data economy. The central thesis: modern systems do not fight the existence of God. They make the crossing point uninhabitable.

Keywords

Non-derivative Being; crossing point; Now; community; multitude; displacement; *Das Man*; lemniscate; Legion; Gaitan Topology; ontological function; false center; evacuation; personal identity; infinite interior

A Note on Method

This essay draws on philosophical argument, theological interpretation, and cultural analysis simultaneously. These modes are not equivalent, and the essay does not treat them as such. Philosophical arguments must stand on structural grounds. Theological identifications – particularly the identification of the sustaining ground with the I AM of Exodus – are offered as the name that fits the structural requirement the argument independently establishes, not as premises imported from scripture. Literary and cinematic references are used as witnesses

to structural conditions, not as evidence for metaphysical claims. A reader who accepts the philosophical argument but not the theological identification has a coherent position. The essay does not require the identification; it proposes it.

I. Prologue: The Wrong Battle

There is a line in the British television series *Britannia* that does more philosophical work than most academic arguments about secularization. A Roman commander, explaining imperial strategy to a subordinate, says: you do not fight the druids. You fight their gods.

The subordinate hears a military tactic. The philosopher hears an ontological claim. The druids are not a belief system to be refuted. They are a community of crossing points – people whose identity, whose shared life, whose very capacity for resistance is constituted by a ground that precedes and sustains them. You cannot dissolve this by argument. You cannot dissolve it by persecution.

The ground is not located in any body you can kill, in any building you can burn, in any argument you can win. The ground is what holds the Now open – the invariant condition of actualization that the tradition names, in its most precise formulation, I AM WHO I AM.

Messala, in William Wyler's *Ben-Hur*, arrives at the same strategic insight from a different direction. When Judah Ben-Hur refuses to collaborate with Rome, Messala does not respond with theology. He responds with politics: you fight an idea with another idea. He understands, with the clarity of the genuinely dangerous, that what binds Judah to something Rome cannot reach is not sentiment or stubbornness but structure. There is a ground to which Judah is accountable that no imperial apparatus can access. To defeat Judah, you do not refute his god. You occupy the position his god holds in his architecture of meaning.

Both men are describing the same operation, and both ultimately fail. This essay is about why they fail – and about the operation that finally succeeds.

The operation that succeeds does not argue against God. It does not persecute believers. It does not attempt to occupy the

sacred position with a rival theology. It does something structurally simpler and devastatingly more effective: it evacuates the self from the only location where the question of what grounds the Now could become urgent. It makes the crossing point uninhabitable – not by attacking it, but by ensuring the self never arrives there long enough to feel what holds it open.

This essay traces that operation across three registers: the structure of the self, the structure of the social field, and the structure of the present moment itself. It argues that understanding this operation requires a prior understanding of what God's role actually is – not in theology, but in ontology. And it argues that the modern system has accomplished, through frictionless architectural means, what no empire achieved through force: the voluntary departure of the self from the crossing point, thumb-stroke by thumb-stroke, without awareness of loss, without a struggle, and without a single argument against the existence of God.

II. What God Actually Does

THE STRUCTURE OF THE NOW

Before the essay can argue that God's role has been displaced, it must be precise about what that role is. The common answer – that God created the world, or that God watches over it, or that God intervenes in events – misses the structural claim. The role at stake is not historical but ontological, and it concerns not what God did, but what God does, continuously, at every moment.

The Now – the present moment – is not a feeling. It is not a brief duration, a thin slice of time between past and future. A slice, however thin, has thickness. The Now has none. It is the singular point of actualization: the place where potential becomes real, where what could be crosses into what is.

Before the Now, an event is possible. After the Now, it is past. At the Now, it is actual. That crossing has no width. It is not one moment among many. It is the condition that makes any moment possible at all. Every memory is retrieved now. Every anticipation is formed now. Every act of consciousness, every

decision, every breath occurs now. The Now is not where some events happen. It is the only mode of existence that is ever actual.

FROM THINNESS TO DEPENDENCY: THE ANALYTIC BRIDGE

A skeptical philosopher will ask at this point: why does the zero-thickness of the Now imply a sustaining Being, rather than simply a structural feature of temporal consciousness? The question is correct, and the argument must be made explicitly rather than rhetorically.

The move is this. A thing with no intrinsic thickness has no intrinsic reserves – no depth from which to draw its own continuation. This is not a claim about perception or phenomenology. It is a structural claim about what self-sustenance requires. To sustain itself from moment to moment, a thing must have something from which to draw that sustenance. The Now, having zero thickness, has nothing of the kind. It is therefore not self-sustaining.

A thing that is not self-sustaining is dependent – it requires a condition outside itself to hold it in existence. The question then becomes: can that dependency recurse infinitely within temporal succession? Can the Now at t be sustained by the Now at $t-1$, which was sustained by the Now at $t-2$, and so on without terminus?

The answer is no, for the same reason that an infinite regress of contingent causes does not discharge explanatory responsibility but multiplies it. Each Now in the series is itself dependent – itself without intrinsic reserves, itself requiring a sustaining condition. Extending the series adds more things requiring explanation. It does not produce a thing capable of providing it. Adding links is not an answer to what holds the chain.

The chain requires a terminus that is outside the series of dependent Nows – something that does not itself require a prior Now to hold it open, something that is not within the succession it makes possible. That terminus must be non-derivative: not receiving its existence from another condition, not sustained by something prior to it, not located within the temporal sequence it grounds. It must simply and unconditionally **be**.

This is a philosophical conclusion, not a theological premise. The I AM of Exodus – pure, unqualified, self-sustaining present tense – is the name that fits this structural requirement with precision. It is not merely symbolic. It is the grammatical form of non-derivative actuality – the only linguistic structure that matches the ontological requirement, not I am because something else sustains me, but the absolute present tense that needs no ground behind it because it is the ground.

WHY THE ROLE CANNOT BE ARGUED AWAY

This structural fact is what makes every attempt to defeat God by argument, persecution, or ideological replacement ultimately futile. The non-derivative ground is not a proposition that can be refuted. It is the condition of the Now in which propositions exist, in which events occur, in which agents act. You cannot argue against the condition of argument.

You can, however, install a contingent substitute in the social position the non-derivative ground occupies. And you can ensure the self is never still long enough to notice the difference. These are the two moves the essay traces. Neither touches the ground. Both can make it functionally invisible for a generation.

The logic of substitution runs through every historical attempt at replacement. Rome installed the Emperor. The Emperor was contingent, mortal, dependent on the same chain of conditions as everyone else. The position rejected the substitute. The modern state installed ideology. Ideology is derivative, historically conditioned, falsifiable by events. The position rejected the substitute. The data economy installs the algorithm. The position will reject this too.

But here is the crucial asymmetry: the collapse of a false center produces a void, not a return. The self that has spent decades orbiting a false center has, in that time, lost the interior practice of standing at the crossing point and asking what holds it open. When the false center fails, what appears is not a rival truth but emptiness – not the productive emptiness of genuine questioning, but the disorientation of a self that has forgotten there was a position to fill.

III. Community and Multitude

THE TOPOLOGY OF PRESENCE

The distinction between community and multitude is not a matter of size, coherence, or shared purpose. It is a matter of whether persons are present at their own crossing points within the collective they constitute.

Community, in the precise sense this essay requires, is constituted by crossing points genuinely coinciding in the one shared Now. The early Christians who held everything in common were not organized around an ideology. They were organized around a shared encounter with a presence that each of them carried individually. The community was the aggregate of genuine selves – persons who could each say I am, and mean one undivided thing, before they said we are.

Lope de Vega's Fuenteovejuna makes this topology visible in its most dramatic form. When the royal investigators arrive and demand to know who killed the Commander, the entire village answers as one: Fuenteovejuna did it. No individual name is given. No particular hand is identified. The collective voice assumes full responsibility.

On the surface this looks like the erasure of individual identity into collective anonymity. It is topologically the opposite. The villagers who answer as one have first lived as many real persons – eating together, working together, celebrating and grieving together, being violated together by the Commander whose abuse was the occasion of the killing. Their shared voice does not emerge from the erasure of individual identity but from its prior fullness. They know each other's names. Their **we** is dense because the persons who constitute it are gathered, not evacuated.

This is the distinction between community and crowd in structurally precise terms. The crowd borrows a center that no individual possesses. The community amplifies centers that each individual already occupies. The crowd speaks because no one will speak. The community speaks because everyone already has. Genuine we presupposes genuine I.

THE MULTITUDE AND ITS FALSE CENTER

The multitude is the structural inversion of community. It is not chaos – it is order in the wrong key. Enough selves orbiting the same false center produce something that looks, from the outside, like community. It has shared language, shared aesthetics, shared enemies. What it lacks is the interior itself: crossing points genuinely present to each other in the shared Now.

The figure of Legion in Mark's Gospel is the theological symbol of the multitude at its extreme. My name is Legion, for we are many. The demoniac has not lost intelligence – he is articulate, even eloquent. He has not lost awareness – he recognizes Christ. What he has lost is singularity: the capacity to say I and mean one thing.

Legion is not a collection of independent wills. It is a unified distortion field – many false centers reinforcing each other's gravity, making the host's return to his own crossing point practically unimaginable from the inside. What is true of one man is true, at scale, of a civilization. When enough selves have installed pride, deferral, desire, or fusion at their centers, the distortion ceases to be individual and becomes environmental. The false center is no longer a private aberration. It becomes the shared air.

The vocabulary needed to name the crossing point is not abolished. It is made unintelligible. The concept of sin does not need to be prohibited. It only needs to become quaint. The mimetic chain that the serpent inaugurated in the garden has its modern expression in the scroll. The original temptation was vertical: you will be like God. It was false, but it was oriented. The modern iteration has lost even its direction. The promise is no longer you will be like God, but you will be like them – like the influencer, like the stranger with the curated life.

I want to be you. You want to be him. He wants to be her. The chain has no first term and no last term. It is a closed loop without a crossing point: the serpent's curve, which resembles the lemniscate but lacks its defining feature. It never crosses. It never passes through the I am. Motion without arrival.

IV. Three Modes of Attack – and Why Only One Works

MODE ONE: PHYSICAL ELIMINATION

The ruins of the roman Colosseum.

"But the Church is still here".

Monsignor Hugh O'Flaherty's line to Colonel Herbert Kappler in the film *The Scarlet and the Black* is the most compressed possible statement of why persecution fails against a non-derivative ground. O'Flaherty does not argue theology. He points at architecture. The stones in which they are standing were built by men who entertained themselves watching Christians die. Those men are gone. The entertainment is gone. The empire is a ruin open to tourists. The community that was supposed to be destroyed is conducting its business two thousand years later in the same city.

The structural reason is precise. The self cannot be replaced. Replacement requires a boundary – a point of discontinuity at which one state ceases, and another begins. But the continuous infinite interior of every transition admits no such boundary, and therefore no locus at which replacement could occur. The self that is being persecuted persists not by resisting change but because the interior of every transition is necessarily too continuous to permit its erasure. The persecutor is using the wrong instrument entirely.

More than this: persecution operates on the material plane against a ground that does not primarily reside there. Kill every Christian in the Colosseum and the crossing point remains untouched. Each martyr became a fixed coordinate in the memory loop of the community – permanent, unreachable, continuing to generate effects long after the event passed into the past. The Romans were building the Church with their own instruments.

MODE TWO: IDEOLOGICAL DISPLACEMENT

The Roman commander in Britannia is smarter than Nero. He understands that the druids are not primarily bodies to be eliminated but a structure of presence to be occupied. This is Messala's insight translated into military doctrine: identify the load-bearing structure of the community's identity and replace it with something that performs the same social function while serving other interests.

This mode is more sophisticated and more effective. It produced centuries of syncretism – the absorption of local sacred sites into Roman temples, the rebranding of feast days, the slow replacement of native deities with Romanized equivalents. In the modern period it produces the capture of religious language by therapeutic culture, by nationalism, by consumer capitalism – each of which speaks of meaning, purpose, transcendence, and community while evacuating the structural content of those terms.

But it ultimately fails against a non-derivative ground for the same reason that a contingent substitute fails at any explanatory terminus: the substitute reveals its contingency when it collapses, and all contingent centers collapse. The salary disappears. The ideology is falsified by events. The therapeutic narrative runs out of comfort at the edge of death. And when the substitute collapses, the restlessness that Augustine named returns, pointing beyond itself to what the substitute was never capable of providing.

Here is the precise point at which Mode Two becomes Mode Three – and the distinction matters. Mode Two fails because the substitute collapses and the position reasserts itself as vacant. The restlessness returns. Someone, somewhere, begins to ask what the substitute was never capable of answering. Mode Three does not make this mistake. It does not attempt to fill the position. It evacuates the person who might notice the position is empty. The difference is between installing a false god and ensuring no one stands still long enough to feel that any god is needed.

Mode Two requires the self to be present enough to accept the substitute. Mode Three targets presence itself. It is the more complete operation – and the one that leaves no obvious wound, no site of resistance, no martyr to remember and no argument to refute. It simply moves the self away from the crossing point,

frictionlessly, one thumb-stroke at a time, until the question of what grounds the Now has become not forbidden but unthinkable.

MODE THREE: THE EVACUATION OF THE NOW

It is six-forty in the morning. A city bus moves through the ordinary geography of a commute. Fifty passengers occupy the seats and the standing room. Forty-eight of them are scrolling – not reading, not searching for something specific, but scrolling: the vertical drag of the thumb across glass, the consumption of content that has not been selected so much as delivered. The faces are lit from below. The eyes move but do not fix. The body is present and the self is elsewhere.

This is not distraction. Distraction implies a momentary interruption, a lapse, something that ends when attention returns. What is operating here is extraction – the removal of consciousness from the only location where consciousness can operate, and its relocation into a manufactured elsewhere. The scroll is not a window. It is a pipeline. It moves the self out of the moment and into a current that has no origin the user chose and no destination the user will reach.

A clarification the argument requires: the medium is not intrinsically evacuating. The same device, in the hands of a student without access to a research library, can function as a window outward – toward knowledge, toward the expansion of the Now, toward a denser life despite material scarcity. Technology used by a present self can deepen rather than evacuate. The critique is directed at the incentive architecture governing the technology, not at the technology itself. An algorithm optimized for engagement will extract attention regardless of what the medium could theoretically support. The issue is not the screen. It is what the screen is governed to do.

The crossing point – the micro-gap between impulse and response, the infinitesimal interval where freedom lives, where the orientation of the will can change – requires presence. The scroll ensures the self is structurally elsewhere at every moment. Not forbidden from the crossing point. Not argued away from it. Simply extracted, continuously, frictionlessly, in a gesture so habitual it has become invisible.

The question what holds this open? is only urgent when you are actually in the Now – present, still, with the friction of reality and the silence underneath it. Extract the self into the scroll, and the question never forms. Not suppressed. Not answered. Simply never asked. The non-derivative ground continues to hold the Now open for the extracted self, because it holds the Now open for everyone simultaneously. But the self for whom the Now is held open is not there to feel the ground beneath it.

This is why Mode Three succeeds where Modes One and Two fail. Persecution confirms the ground. Ideological displacement is rejected when the substitute collapses. Evacuation produces nothing to confirm and nothing to reject – because the self is not present for any confrontation. The crossing point is not attacked. It is abandoned. Not in defiance. Not through argument. Simply by not being there.

V. The Machinery of Evacuation

DAS MAN AT SCALE – AND ITS LIMIT

Martin Heidegger identified the social mechanism of evacuation before the technology arrived to complete it. He called it Das Man – the they-self, the anonymous One into which human existence defaults when it has not been claimed from within. Das Man is the condition of a self that has lost its mineness: the irreducible quality by which existence belongs to this person and no other. The fallen self does not exist from an owned center. It exists through inherited opinions, borrowed anxieties, and anonymous norms.

A methodological note is required here. Heidegger's diagnostic of Das Man is used in this essay as a precise instrument for identifying the social mechanism of evacuation – the way the anonymous 'they' replaces the particular 'I', and the way the cost of honest perception is raised above the threshold most people are willing to pay. On this diagnostic level, Heidegger's analysis is exact and irreplaceable.

However, Heidegger himself carefully avoided the metaphysical-theological move this essay makes. He would classify

the argument for a non-derivative sustaining ground as onto-theology – precisely the metaphysical structure he spent his career dismantling. The essay acknowledges this disagreement directly: Heidegger diagnoses the evacuation of presence with unmatched precision, but his ontology deliberately forecloses the conclusion this essay draws from it. Das Man is borrowed as a diagnostic tool. The ontological argument is the essay's own.

Hans Christian Andersen understood the social mechanism of Das Man with a precision no sociologist has improved upon. The Emperor's New Clothes is not a story about vanity. It is a story about what happens to perception when the individual gaze has been replaced by the shared gaze of the anonymous they. The tailors offer clothing invisible to anyone unfit for their office. Nobody lies. Everyone performs. Each courtier, seeing the others nod and admire, concludes that the fault must be their own. The illusion requires only a social field in which the anonymous they see has replaced the particular I see.

The child who speaks is the figure of the first person singular restored. Note what the child does not do: the child does not argue, does not cite evidence, does not construct a case. The child simply reports what it sees. That simplicity is not naivety. It is the structure of presence. From an inhabited center, the report is unavoidable: the Emperor has nothing on. Das Man does not primarily corrupt logic. It corrupts position.

Contemporary digital culture is Das Man with industrial infrastructure. The mechanisms are different – more distributed, more frictionless, accelerated by algorithmic platforms – but the structure is identical. The anonymous they of a timeline or comment section raises the cost of honest perception above the threshold most people are willing to pay. The result is a civilization of courtiers: each privately unsure, each publicly nodding, the shared performance sustaining an appearance that no single person believes but that everyone confirms.

THE CHAIN OF HOLLOW CENTERS

The forty-eight commuters on the bus are not scrolling freely in the way that matters. The architecture they operate within was not built to serve their choices. It was built to capture their attention, metabolize it, and convert it into data, engagement metrics, and revenue.

But the more structurally devastating observation is this: the exterior players are not the center either. The algorithm serves the engagement metric. The metric serves the revenue model. The revenue model serves the quarterly report. The quarterly report serves a shareholder who is scrolling on another bus. It is a hierarchy of hollow centers. Everyone is a satellite. No one is the sun.

The user orbits the platform. The platform orbits the market. The market orbits a projection of growth that has not yet materialized. Each node holds every other node. Nothing holds the net. At the base of what the modern world calls stability there is no base – only the appearance of stability between objects equally dependent on conditions neither controls.

When the net fails – when the salary disappears, when the platform collapses, when the ideology is falsified – what appears is not a rival truth but the void: the specific, quiet emptiness of a self constituted entirely by its orbit, with nothing left when the orbit breaks.

SATAN CHANGED CAREERS

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe understood the architecture of damnation with more precision than most theologians. In *Faust*, Mephistopheles does not steal a soul. He earns one. The terms of the bargain are precise: if ever Faust experiences a moment so complete, so satisfying, that he wishes it to remain – *Stay, thou art so fair* – the bargain is sealed.

Damnation requires the soul's own consent, given at a moment of genuine arrest. The devil had to produce something magnificent to earn those five words. The soul had to be present at the crossing point, conscious, arrested by beauty or knowledge or love, saying yes to something it believed was worth the cost. Even in its corruption, the soul was confirming its own significance: it was

worth pursuing, worth the elaborate theater of temptation, worth a deal.

Recent digital engineering has been devoted, with remarkable precision, to manufacturing that sensation at industrial scale – at negligible cost. The infinite scroll. The autoplay that begins before you have decided to continue. The algorithm that learns from your pauses, your returns, your three-in-the-morning viewing history exactly what produces one more minute of arrested attention.

The entire apparatus is a machine for generating the feeling of *Stay, thou art so fair* without the thing that feeling was built to respond to. Not transcendence. Not beauty or knowledge or love. The simulation of arrest. Engineered compulsion wearing the mask of satisfaction. Faust said those words once, to something he believed was worth his soul. The modern user says them ten thousand times a day – to a reel, to a notification, to a camera angle approved by a committee – without knowing they are saying anything at all.

But the more precise observation is structural. Satan did not merely lower his standards. He changed careers entirely. The old transaction required the soul present at the crossing point – conscious, deliberating, making a choice however corrupted. The soul had to be there to be bought. Which meant the soul, even in its moment of damnation, was confirming its own significance. It was worth pursuing. Worth the elaborate theater of temptation. Worth a deal. The soul was the protagonist of its own loss.

The new model does not need the soul present at all. It needs the data trail the extracted self leaves behind – the pauses, the returns, the viewing history, the hesitations that reveal desire before the self has articulated it to itself. The soul is not the product. The soul is the raw material from which the product is refined. And the product is sold not to the soul but about the soul, to third parties it will never meet, for purposes it never consented to and cannot fully trace.

In the old transaction, a negotiation took place. Two parties. A crossing point occupied by both. The soul's significance was, in a perverse sense, honored – it had to be wanted badly enough to bargain for. In the new transaction, there is no negotiation. There is only harvesting. The soul is not bought. It is processed. The

crossing point where the bargain would have been struck is bypassed entirely, because the self is never there long enough for a bargain to be possible.

Satan is not buying souls anymore. He is selling personal information to the algorithms. And the product is you – not the you that stands at the crossing point and says I am, but the behavioral residue of a self that was never quite there, extracted and packaged and delivered to an advertiser before it had finished forming its next thought.

VI. The Self that cannot be reached

WHY THE CROSSING POINT SURVIVES

The argument of this essay would be despair if it ended with the evacuation. It does not end there, because the evacuation does not reach what it is evacuating from.

The crossing point – the Now held open by the non-derivative ground – is ontologically indestructible by any of the three modes examined above. It cannot be reached by persecution, which attacks the body and leaves the ground untouched. It cannot be reached by ideological displacement, which installs a contingent substitute the position will eventually reject. And it cannot be reached by evacuation, which removes the self from the crossing point without touching the crossing point itself.

The self that has been extracted into the scroll for years is not a different self. It is the same self that has traversed a continuous infinite interior to arrive at a new condition – carrying within it the entire history of its crossings, including every crossing point abandoned, every micro-gap not occupied, every morning spent on the bus with the face lit from below.

These crossings are not lost. They are permanent coordinates in the memory loop, fixed, unreachable, real. The practice of presence is not destroyed by years of extraction. It is buried. Not absent. Buried. The soul knows, underneath the interference of sensation and habit and manufactured urgency, what it always already was.

The non-derivative ground sustains the Now for everyone simultaneously. The Now that is held open for the forty-eight commuters is the same Now held open for the two who looked up from the screen. The crossing point does not require acknowledgment to continue its function. The mercy embedded in this structure is not sentimental. It is architectural: the crossing point remains open for the person deepest in the Ghost Zone, because the sustaining ground does not withdraw.

THE KNOCK

There is an image in the book of Revelation that the evacuation cannot reach. Behold, I stand at the door and knock. The knocking is not conditional on the self being at the crossing point. It does not wait for the self to have achieved sufficient presence before announcing itself. It knocks at the door of the self that is scrolling, the self that is orbiting a false center, the self that has dissolved into the mimetic chain and cannot say I and mean one thing.

The question what is sustaining this? arises not only in seminars. It arises in the gap between putting down the phone and re-entering the room. In the thin residue of thinness – the sense that time has passed but nothing has occurred, that the morning happened without being inhabited, that the life inside it is less dense than it should be. That residue is the trace of the abandoned crossing point. It does not shout. It does not break anything. It simply accumulates, year after year, until the person arrives at a threshold – retirement, illness, loss, the death of someone whose crossing point had been constitutive of their own – and discovers that the question was always there, waiting, at the one location where they had never stayed long enough to hear it.

The knock has no timestamp. It does not expire. The prodigal son does not arrive home restored. He arrives while still a long way off – and the father runs toward him. The turn is enough. The reorientation of the crossing point toward the direction from which grace arrives is not an achievement requiring preparation. It is a reception. And the reception is available at every moment the Now is held open – which is every moment there is.

VII. The Three Modes and the Topology of the Now

WHY THE TOPOLOGY EXPLAINS WHAT HISTORY CANNOT

The three modes examined in this essay are not merely a historical typology. They are a structural consequence of what the Now is.

The Now, as established in Section II, is the invariant crossing point – the zero-thickness condition of all actualization, held open by a non-derivative ground that is not itself within the succession it makes possible. The lemniscate is the geometric model: a figure-eight whose two loops – memory and anticipation – are only intelligible because they share a crossing point that does not move with them. The crossing point is not one location among many on the curve. It is the condition that makes the curve a lemniscate rather than two unrelated loops.

God, in this topology, is not a presence within the loops. God is what holds the crossing point open. God is the sustaining condition of the Now itself – not a being who inhabits the present alongside the self, but the ground without which there is no present for either to inhabit.

Given this structure, the three modes of attack map precisely onto the three ways one might try to destabilize a crossing point:

Mode One attempts to destroy the beings who pass through the crossing point. It fails because the crossing point is not located in the beings who traverse it. Killing every person who passes through a doorway does not close the doorway. The Romans killed the Christians. The crossing point – the Now held open by the *I AM* – remained. New persons arrived at it. The community reconstituted around what was never in the bodies that were destroyed.

Mode Two attempts to replace the ground with a substitute. It fails because no contingent ground can sustain the weight of what only a non-derivative ground can hold. The substitute performs the social function of the ground for a time – organizing the community, providing shared meaning, anchoring identity. But the substitute is dependent, and dependency reveals itself eventually. When it does, the position does not remain filled with the substitute. It reasserts itself as vacant, and the restlessness

returns pointing beyond the substitute to what the substitute was pointing away from.

Mode Three does not attack the crossing point. It does not attack the ground. It targets presence itself – the capacity of the self to arrive at the crossing point and remain there long enough to feel what holds it open. In terms of the lemniscate: it does not damage the figure, does not move the crossing point, does not replace the ground. It simply ensures the curve never reaches the center. The self oscillates perpetually in the loops – between memory and anticipation, between the left loop of what was and the right loop of what might be – without ever passing through the crossing point where the ground can be felt as necessary.

This is the serpent's curve made civilizational: a geometry of perpetual motion without arrival. The loops are real. The motion is real. The content – the scroll, the metric, the projection, the manufactured urgency – is real enough to occupy the self completely. What is absent is the crossing. What is absent is the Now. What is absent is the one location where the question of what grounds the present moment could become not merely philosophical but existentially unavoidable.

THE ASYMMETRY THAT THE TOPOLOGY REVEALS

The topological analysis reveals an asymmetry that purely historical analysis misses. Modes One and Two are reversible: persecution ends, substitutes collapse, and the crossing point reasserts itself. The community that survived persecution is still a community with the memory and practice of arriving at the crossing point. The community that was offered a substitute and found it wanting can recognize the vacancy the substitute left behind.

Mode Three produces a different kind of damage. It does not damage the crossing point. It damages the self's capacity to find it. A generation formed entirely within the loops – without the practice of presence, without the interior tradition of standing at the crossing point and asking what holds it open, without the lived memory of a community constituted by genuine encounter rather than manufactured belonging – does not know what it is missing. It does not experience the void as absence. It experiences it as the natural state of things.

This is why the transmission of presence is not incidental to the religious community but constitutive of it. What the community transmits is not primarily doctrine or practice, though these matters. What it transmits is the habit of arriving at the crossing point — the interior capacity to stand at the center of the lemniscate and remain there long enough to feel the ground beneath the curve. Doctrine can be recovered. The habit of presence, if it is not transmitted, must be reconstructed from within a culture that has been systematically organized to prevent it.

The reconstruction is not impossible. The crossing point has not moved. The ground has not withdrawn. The knock continues. And there is one structural fact on which the entire essay rests and to which it finally returns: the Now cannot be permanently evacuated, because the Now is not the self's possession to evacuate. The Now is held open by something outside the self, outside the loops, outside the entire apparatus of extraction and substitution. Whatever empties the self from the crossing point cannot empty the crossing point itself.

What it can do — and what the modern operation has accomplished with remarkable efficiency — is ensure that a civilization stands at the edge of a ground it no longer recognizes, feeling a restlessness it can no longer name, scrolling past the silence in which the question would form, one thumb-stroke at a time, in the only place where the answer has always been waiting.

VIII. Conclusion: The Ground That Cannot Be Made Uninhabitable

The Roman commander in Britannia was right about the strategy. You do not fight the druids. You fight their gods. But he was wrong about what fighting their gods requires. It does not require argument. It does not require persecution. It does not require a better theology. It requires the systematic production of an environment in which the self never arrives at the crossing point long enough to feel the ground beneath its feet.

This is what the modern system has accomplished, not through conspiracy but through emergent incentive architecture – through the cumulative effect of a million locally rational decisions, each one capturing a little more attention, extracting a little more presence from the only location where presence operates. No one designed the chain of orbiting as a whole. No one controls it as a whole. It reproduces itself because each node in the chain is doing what appears locally rational, and the aggregate effect is a civilization of satellites orbiting a vacancy.

The vacancy is not God's absence. God is precisely what holds the Now open in which the satellite orbits, in which the scroll is consumed, in which the data is harvested and sold, in which the false center performs its temporary gravity. The vacancy is the self's absence from the crossing point. The room is intact. The ground is intact. What is missing is the inhabitant.

And here the modern operation reaches its structural limit. It can evacuate the self from the crossing point. It cannot remove the crossing point. It can produce a generation without the interior practice of genuine presence, without the tradition of standing at the crossing point and asking what holds it open. It cannot prevent the void from forming when the false center collapses. And the false center will collapse, because dependent things cannot do what only a non-dependent ground can do.

The restlessness will return – pointing, as it always has, beyond itself, toward what the substitute was never capable of providing. Augustine named it sixteen centuries ago: our heart is restless until it rests in Thee. The restlessness is not a malfunction. It is the self, finally without anesthesia, beginning to look for what actually holds.

The crossing point has not moved. It is held open by the one who does not say I was or I will be – the grammar of every false center, every substitute, every horizon-surrogate the modern system provides. The crossing point is held open by the pure, unqualified, self-sustaining present tense: I AM. Not ahead on the horizon. Not behind in memory. At the center, where the curve must pass to be a lemniscate rather than the serpent's drift.

What has changed is that an entire civilization has been trained, thumb-stroke by thumb-stroke, to never stand still long enough to feel the ground beneath their feet.

The ground has not moved.

*The crossing point does not require acknowledgment to hold.
It only requires, for the question to arise, a self present
enough to ask it.*

References

Sacred Scripture

Exodus 3:14 – I AM WHO I AM: the divine self-disclosure as the grammatical statement of non-derivative Being.

Genesis 2:24 – Two become one flesh: the ontological prerequisites of genuine communion.

Genesis 3:1-14 – The serpent's temptation and the grammar of the future tense.

Mark 5:1-20 – The Gerasene demoniac; Legion; the man restored to his right mind.

Revelation 3:20 – Behold, I stand at the door and knock.

Revelation 13:17, King James Version

Matthew 6:24 – No one can serve two masters.

Luke 15:11-32 – The Prodigal Son and the structure of return.

Philosophical and Literary Sources

Augustine of Hippo. Confessions. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Oxford University Press, 1991.

Andersen, Hans Christian. 'The Emperor's New Clothes.' In Fairy Tales Told for Children. Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzel, 1837.

Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Benziger Bros., 1947.

Aristotle. Physics. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Bergson, Henri. Time and Free Will. Translated by F.L. Pogson. Allen & Unwin, 1910.

Darío, Rubén. Lo Fatal. Cantos de Vida y Esperanza. 1905.

Donne, John. Devotions upon Emergent Occasions, Meditation XVII. 1624.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. Anchor Books, 1961.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Harper & Row, 1962.

Kafka, Franz. *The Metamorphosis*. Translated by Stanley Corngold. Bantam, 1972.

Papini, Giovanni. *Il Giudizio Universale*. Florence: Vallecchi, 1923.

Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press, 1984.

Vega, Lope de. *Fuenteovejuna*. c. 1612-1614.

Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. 1890.

Cinematic and Television References

Butterworth, Jez (creator). *Britannia*. Amazon Prime Video / Sky Atlantic, 2018-2021.

London, Jerry (director). *The Scarlet and the Black*. CBS, 1983.

Wyler, William (director). *Ben-Hur*. MGM, 1959.

Author's Prior Works

Gaitan, Oscar. *Does Time Need Me, or Do I Need Time?* Zenodo, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15302684>

Gaitan, Oscar. *Zero Returned: An Ontological Reading of Decimal Structure*. Zenodo, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19893877>

Gaitan, Oscar. *The Infinite Interior: On Space, Change, and the Integrity of the Self*. Zenodo, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20032817>

Gaitan, Oscar. *A Letter to an Atheist*. Zenodo, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19870600>

Gaitan, Oscar. *The Am That Remains: A Critique of Descartes and a Metaphysics of the Soul*. Zenodo, 2026.

Gaitan, Oscar. The Topology of Presence: Four Planes of Existence on the Lemniscate. Zenodo, 2026.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19684052>

Gaitan, Oscar. The Alternate Lemniscate: On the Geometry of Displacement. Zenodo, 2026.

Gaitan, Oscar. The Serpent, the Self, and the Collapse of the 'I'. Zenodo, 2026.

Gaitan, Oscar. Das Man and the First Person Singular. Zenodo, 2026.

Gaitan, Oscar. Two Meanings of 'Is': Heidegger's Horizon and the Crossing Point. Zenodo, 2026.

Gaitan, Oscar. The Is and the AM: Presence, Identity, and the Ground that Holds. Zenodo, 2026.

Gaitán, Oscar. *Where Is God? Suffering, the Present Moment, and the Ground That Does Not Intervene.*